

In the Claims

Cancel claims 31 and 33, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Remarks

The present request for reconsideration is proffered in response to the Office Action of April 19, 2002, in which claims 26 and 27 stand objected to, claims 25 and 28-35 stand rejected, and claims 36-40 stand allowed.

At the outset, Applicants express their appreciation for the Examiner's careful review of their application and the allowance of their claims 36-40.

In the Office Action, claims 25, 30, 32, and 35 stand rejected as being anticipated by U.S. patent 4,041,519 ("Melen"). In response, Applicants respectfully submit that Melen neither teaches nor suggests first and second gate structures having different fermi levels, as recited in independent claim 25 (and as recited in claims 30, 32, and 35 via their dependency on claim 25). As taught in the last paragraph on page 5 (bridging to page 6) of the present application, the "fermi level" of a gate is the extent to which has an affinity for inversion carriers. For gates to have different fermi levels, they must differ from one another in terms of doping or some other significant conductivity characteristic.

In Melen, there is absolutely no teaching or suggestion that the two conductors 88, 90 have any difference in conductivity characteristics. If anything, the overall image sensor teachings of Melen would suggest that the two conductors have the same conductivity characteristics. Note in the generic process description of the device taught by Melen, a single P polysilicon layer is taught that provides both the "row gate" 60 and "shield" 62 shown in the front figure of Melen. Col. 6, lines 28-53. There is no process step taught that would introduce any sort of differential